2/7/70

Dear Paul,

For ease in filing I take up other things separately.

By the way, I do not think the articles on the "successes" of the exiles is worth the trouble. If you ever want them, I have them. I have mislaid the political story from the T-p. If I do not find it, I may ask you for a copy. It is rpobably deep in one of themany stacks of stuff here.

Davison: I disabree, as I will explain. But first I should say you should evaluate what may be my selfish interests that I do not think influence this but you might. I think it will go very well with what I have for AGENT OSWALD and will mean more there. Talking to the principal now, if there is anything in it, will blow everything. But let me take up the things you do.

If Mama D is as the stories say, it may not be completely rodiculous that her son directed a Russianemigre to her-and only one who knew whether or not she had seen any recently and what her reaction was if she had could evaluate/ He may, indeed, have believed his mother would like it. However, is this, really, material? Suppose he did? Does this in any way alter the rest? I think not. However, for a variety of reasons, I have been working on a good, reportorial source. It will take time, until a mutual friend can be in touch, and then I'll know. There arexxxxxx other things also to be checked and done there, on this and other things. I think there is time.

Your points on the Archives checks are so obvious I shame for not thinking of them. As soon as I can I'xx do it. There are other things to be done there, however, that are of more immediate importance. However, I am starting a little notebook of things to do there and I'll gradually get them all done.

Why do you feel someone should talk to D soon? What is urgent? I think that before then, there remains checking to be done. I have a reporter friend in NYC, where he has returned to Columbia to take a doctorate in lit, who can and will check things out there, and there are things that might well be looked into. One example. The stories I sent you refer to articles in Russian other than you got. We should get them. I had one man try and get Front of the Secret War. I have two others trying for it now. Let us see what there is in these sources, for we may miss a very good thing...I have learned that at times one must be patient, that sometimes it takes time to do things right. I think we must go on the assumption that there may be something to this. We cannot establish it in haste, and we have little to gain by haste, especially when compared to what we may lose. I assume he has been spoken to whether or not there is something here. But suppose he hasn't-suppose he is unaware of this interpretation of what he regarded as an innocent thing? Why should he talk then, if he hasn't been spoken to? I'd like to talk to him myself, when I am as well prepared as possible, and it now is remotely possible that I may get to Atlanta in connection with COUP. More when there is more definiteness.

Yes, I have been in touch with Wise. He opposes us. This is true of all the others you list except Sherrill, who just will not get interested. I have xxxxx approached them in the past. When we are together again, I'll tell you what Harwood shifted the Post away from 5/66. Do not be deceived by the good in that story. It was the very least he could get away with after what had been arranged. He killed

ever so much more-then and since. The exception is Goulden. I have been intending to get in touch with him on the old matter. Vince has steadfastly refused to give me his stories. When I've been able to try him he has been away, I suppose promoting his (apparently good) book. After I have met him and can learn his attitude, now that he is no longer with the Bulletin, I'll know better. But by and large, Washington correspondents are best left alone on this entire subject. Very few of them are for us and the few who may be are afraid and cannot be trusted. Cook is an incompetent and, in my book, despite some very fine work, another Turner. He is, to my knowledge and within my experience, dishonest on this subject, and has done disreputable things. His Natikn stories hurt us. He has a thing because he could not come up with anything on his own except error, is bitter because Ramparts would not touch his stuff to begin with, etc. Haven't you noticed his long silence on this?

Ordinarily you are not in a rush, so I presume you may have some reason in this instance. What is it? Maybe we should hurry. I just see no need for it, and I see possibilities of counterproductivity. I have a really major contact on this subject, and if this person can be given an entire package, something might happen that really could be something. You should be able to guess.

The more time I spend with this material the more convinced I become that a single story is not good and that each significant thing should not stand alone. To put it another way, everything should be in a proper context. It was always somewhat this way, but after New Orleans, much more so.

But, should we decide D should be spoken to, I have better candidates than you have suggested, men I can trust, who are with us - and not with US papers, which is the pivotal thing, I believe. If there is a good reason for doing this now, I'll speak to one and get it done, as I think I can. I have one in particular in mind, above others.

On transcripts: my only reason for wanting to restrict any of these is because there are those capable of misusing parts. There was one person in particular I did not want to get some of the previous onps for special reasons, and he got it and bragged that he did even though I didn't want it. In this particular case, I have given N.O.my unpublished material, for the general good, and I do not want that person, who has been very evil with and toward me, to benefit personally or misuse. I do not anticipate this will be true of any of the rest of it. However, if there is an exception, I will tell you, If I do not, assume I have no such desire.

Just heard from Bud today that he has the printouts but not the film. I'll check into this next time in DC, possibly this coming week. He thinks he doesn't have the film because he may not have the entire job back. Mary has never responded on the Texas microfilm, so we'll send that to you. And your own film, also. We can also lend or give you an FPCC printout. It has beem so long he may have forgotten, but I asked Bud to go over this, copy what he wants, and send you the whole thing, to keep. I anticipate nothing that will change his agreement when I speak to him. If he doesn't want to, I'll elnd you my set.

I am not sure, but I think I also asked for the Rowley 1/6/64 to Rankin, about 304 months ago. I'll try again. Meanwhile, if you do not mind sending me that so I can compare it with what I am told, I can write the original source. In fact, I'd like to. I am certain you are correct in assuming these SS reports also covered FBI work, for some was withheld, I believe at FBI request, inc. lab reports of which I've been able tolearn nothing.

Your 2/3 to Gary: check. No need for return NCR copy.

More-HW